

# IMPASSABLE

Issue #61, February 8, 1976

Circulation: 150

Impassable is a postal journal of Diplomacy published and edited by John Boyer, 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013. Phone: (717) 249-1343, between 9 and 10:30 p.m., E.D.S.T., any night except Tuesdays. Sub to Impassable is 10/\$2.00. This is a tri-weekly gamezine, a subsidiary of Chapel Hill Publications founded in March of 1972.

Diplomacy is a registered trademark for a game invented by Allan B. Calhamer and copyright by Games Research, Inc., 500 Harrison Ave., Boston, MA 02119.

## STANDBY POOL

The following are ask to stand-by:

1973BU: Ron Kelly for Italy.

1975G: Lee Kendter for France.

1975T: Eric Luft for France,

1975CS: Walter Blank to take over Austria, and Jim Cooper to ~~take over~~ Italy.\*

New player standings: Albano, Birsan, Bear, Kador, McIlvaine, Fujihara, Brooks, Kelly, Kendter, Luft, Blank, Swies, Cooper.

\*OOPS! Forgot, Richard Swies is to stand-by for Germany in 1975CS. (1975CS is turning out to have problems...only three of the original players have sent in orders this time around and it is only into 1903!)

## OPENINGS

VALINOR, #5. Michael Muchnik, 2520 Hyacinth Court, Westbury, NY 11590. Ditto. Has game openings in reg. dip. Gamefee is \$1.50 + a sub which is \$2.00/10 issues. Excellent ditto printing and is very promising of a gamezine.

REBUS SIC STANTIBUS, #2. The New England Society of Cynics, 65 Winter Avenue, Staten Island, NY 10301. Mimeo. Monthly. A trio runs this one: Drew McGee, Chris McLenoan, and Arne Eastman, but make your checks out to the society! Openings in reg. dip. GF is subscription + \$1.00 for each additional game entered. Sub rate is \$3.00/year. They also have a different sort of Diplomacy game, which they call Grand Tournament Diplomacy. What it amounts to is a multi-player team runs each dippy country. They have rules to cover coups, assassinations, revolts, form-

(cont. page 8)

## HOBBY WIDE NEWS

This issue may actually run short as I am behind time-wise. This was due primarily to the fact that I came down sick last week and it put me a week behind in everything. Then, this past weekend was my birthday and so I couldn't leave my birthday party to work on this. Then, the Olympics were on T-V, and since they come only every four years, it was pretty hard not to watch some of it...if it is late, the deadline will be reset to Saturday (check it out on the outside cover, page 12 or 10).

News is breaking out all over this time around, but I haven't had any time to write it up ahead of time, but I'll dig into the pile of zines and see what we can come up with...

\*\*\*First, there's this reversion to doing Impassable on wax stencils (if you haven't noticed by now). Until I see a large block of my wax stencils go, I can't afford to switch to vinyl stencils. This is something of a predicament, but the offer still goes: 420 wax stencils for the Gestetner for \$70.00 plus postage. I'll mail a sample stencil to interested buyers.

A lot of people wrote to say they liked the new format. Unfortunately, as I have stated above, the switch must be delayed until I can sell some of those stencils! I also have to buy more supplies of those vinyl stencils and to get white mimeo paper.

From Bushwacker (Fred Davis), we learn that the date has been set for ORIGINS II on Friday, July 23 through Sunday, July 25, 1976. It will be at John Hopkins again and Fred Davis advises that people get advance accommodations at the Downtown Holiday Inn in Baltimore if they don't want to sleep in the school's dormitories. Apparently, we will be having an air-conditioned room which will be good for the tourney! But of course, there will be other things going on and there will be enough to keep anyone busy walking around between Diplomacy games with glazed eyes and dreams of conquest....

From Edi Birsan, via his ISE Report, we learn that the IDA Committee headed by the Ombudsman (John Leeder) is investigating Gordon Anderson's default (alleged) on prize money. It is believed that Robert

(cont. page 8)

# VERHANDEL N

BY LEWIS PULSIPHER

## Criticism

I do not mind sincere criticism so long as the critic strives to be objective and explains his reasons. For example Scott Rosenberg and Ben Grossman both disagreed with my first column and we have been able to discuss the differences, though some appear to be irreconcilable. What I do object to, whether directed at me or at someone else, is a subjective vendetta, an ad hominem argument--e.g. "this is bad because Pulsipher wrote it." Yet this is what I have undergone from Len Lakofka for the past several years, and especially in the past six months, and I no longer care to ignore it.

A couple years ago Len gave my Blood and Iron a "C+" in either reliability or physical quality (I don't recall which) WITHOUT HAVING RECEIVED THE ZINE FOR MANY MONTHS (if not years). I did not even have a subber/trader in the Chicago area at the time. How could he know anything about it? This is being responsible? Is this objective? I am sure those who did receive the zine at the time would have disagreed with the rating. More recently he managed to rate the NADPS #2 results very low on his overall quality scales in three separate issues of his zine, without giving any reasons for the rating except to characterize it as "sermonizing". I do not say that the material was great, but the publication history, and the comments on it (which have all been favorable except for Len's) might indicate that such a low rating is not objective. The results were distributed by me to about 50 persons, most of them publishers. Scott Rosenberg printed it in the 75 IDA Handbook. I had intended NOT to submit it to DW--and actually I never did--yet Walt Buchanan went out of his way to obtain permission from Scott to print it in Diplomacy World as well. Also the results are similar to the NADPS #1 results, which was voted third best DW article in Walt's survey of some months ago.

Len and I have had disagreements in the past, but perhaps his reasons for the latest vendetta showed when he told me that I had cost him his chance to be IDA President--this was early this year. Probably this stems from my campaign statement in the election for 1975 IDA officers, I said that readers should not believe all that they read in campaign statements, that they should check around, because two years before one candidate (Len, but I didn't name him or the office he ran for) had presented his record as IFW President to show his fitness for office when in fact he had presided over the dissolution of what was once the largest wargaming group in the USA (over 500 members). At the same time Len, in his Presidential campaign statement, once again made the same extremely misleading claims about his IFW record. Two years before we had gone through the same thing, with Len unable to deny or contradict my charges; why he tried it again I will never know. I doubt that this cost Len the election (his opponent was the incumbent), but it probably wasn't helpful. Clearly, Len held this against me, though I said nothing that wasn't true, and I didn't mention any names. It was his fault that he tried to mislead the voters, not mine. I think his present attitude toward anything I do can be linked directly to his annoyance that I supposedly cost him the election.

Len's remarks about my column are a good example of how NOT to criticize, unless you simply want to cut someone down. It would have been nice if Len had presented substantive commentary-criticism rather than simply assert that "Mr. Pulsipher's set up of the MAG/PG however is a poor one." If Len has a better suggestion to accomplish the purpose I was interested in--raising publishing standards--I wish he would let us know. If he disagreed with my purpose, does that make the article "tripe"? Is anything Len disagrees with a "waste"? His final comment, I think, speaks better of his subjective bias than anything I could say. I daresay I think Len Lakofka is the only person in the hobby who would completely condemn all that I have written or might write. "Since Lew can't publish himself it's a pity we still have to read all of his long-winded tripe in IMPASSABLE, PAROXYSM, SPECULUM, & POCKET ARMENIAN. What a WASTE OF GOOD MAGAZINE SPACE!" (Quotes from Liaisons Dangereuses #63, p. 7.) (Of course, no one forced any of those zines to print my column, and any may reject any particular article they consider not worthwhile.)

The results of a survey Len conducted a few months ago support what I've been saying: 29 people (15 Len's own readers) rated zines in several categories on a 1-10 scale, 10 best. Of the four zines printing my column, I have regularly contributed articles and letters to two heretofore; both have higher article ratings than Len's own zine (7.6 and 7.5 to 7.3).

1970BJ, Summer/Fall 1919

Summer 1919: Italy R A Tyr-Pie

Fall 1919:

AUSTRIA(Beyerlein): a tyr h, a vie s a tyr,  
a ser-alb, a tri s a ser-alb, a bud s a  
tri, a bul/gre

GERMANY(Mahler): a mun s aus a tyr, f hol s  
rus f nth, f hel s f hol

ITALY(Phillips): f nat/nwg, f bel/nth, a pie  
s a ven, f ion s f gre, f eng s f wal-lon,  
a ruh s a bur-bel, a ven h, f gre s f adr-  
alb, a wal-lon, a bur-bel, f adr/alb,  
f ber/pru/nsu/

RUSSIA(Kelly): a sev-arm, a arm-smy, a con/  
gre/imp/, f aeg s a con-gre/nsu/, a sil s  
ger a mun, a ber/kie, f bal/kie, a den-lon,  
a yor s a den-lon, f nth c a den-lon, f  
nwy s f nth, f edi/nat

WINTER 1919/SPRING 1920 orders due Thursday,  
February 26, 1976. (Spring orders conditional)

Fall 1919 SCC:

Austria: hom, ser, bul, rum, ~~gre~~ (6) SP, lost  
1

Germany: kie, mun, hol (3) SP

Italy: hom, tun, mar, spa, por, bre, par,  
lvp, bel, gre (12) B1

Russia: hom, swe, nwy, ank, con, smy, edi,  
lon, den, ber (13) B2, was 2 short.

1971Dbu, Summer/Fall 1916

Summer 1916: Italy R F Ein-Cey, and F Mad-Ara

Fall 1916:

AUSTRIA(Tilson): a rum-sev, f bla s a con-  
bul, a arm s a rum-sev, a bag s a nej-jor,  
a ank-con, a smy/syr/nsu/, a con/bul,  
a nej-jor, a syr h/u/

CHINA(Swies): f tim-tim obb, f cel-tim, f  
sch-sia, f sia-mal, f jav s jap f ein, f  
and-beng, a mad-raj, a snd s a mad-raj,  
a dec s jap f ben-mad, a kas-afg, a afg-  
ira, a tib-nep, a kan h, a bma h

GERMANY(Proujansky): NMR. a stp, a oms, a  
mos, a ukr, a gal, a clu, a bud, a tyr, a  
vie, a lon, f hel, f bal, f bel, f nat,  
f eng, f nwg, f edi, a pic, a bre all hold,  
a sev h/a/

ITALY(Osmanson): f cey s f win, f ara/ira,  
f win s f cey, f mor s f sat, f sat s f  
mor, a ser/bul, a tri/ser, f red s a yem-  
nej, f aeg s a ser-bul, f ade h, a yem-  
nej, a jor s a yem-nej/r/(sue, otb), f  
ion c a apu-gre, a spa h, a ven h, a apu-  
gre

JAPAN(Drews): f ben-mad, f ein s f ben-mad,  
a tur s chi a afg-ira, a sib h, a skg h,

f npa obb s f spa obb-mid, f npa s f spa  
f spa s f npa, f spa obb-mid

AUTUMN/WINTER 1916 orders due Thursday,  
February 26, 1976.

Fall 1916 SCC:

Austria: ~~bul~~, bul, ~~gre~~, rum, sev, ~~ira~~, bag,  
con, smy, ank (7) R1, lost 1

China: hom, sai, bma, tha, cal, vtn, phi,  
del, for, tok, joh, jav, ira (15) B1

England: Ire (1) SP

Germany: hom, bel, den, hol, par, swe, bre,  
edi, mos, stp, war, nwy, oms, vna, lvp,  
lon, ~~gre~~, clu, bud (21) B2, lost 2

Italy: hom, eth, pen, egy, tun, yem, mor,  
mar, spa, cey, tri, ser, ~~ira~~, gre (16) SP

Japan: kyo, osa, kor, kar, vla, omo, bor,  
man, skg, mad (10) B1

1972BW, Spring 1920/Vote

Vote on 2-way draw: defeated by Ger and Rus.

Spring 1920:

FRANCE(Kelly): F Nth h/r/(edi, lon, eng,  
yor, bel, ska, nwg, otb), f hel h, a hol  
h, a bur h, a mar h

GERMANY(Davies): a kie s rus a bel-hol/nso/,  
a ber s a kie

ITALY(Swies): f tun/wes

RUSSIA(Knudsen): f con/bla, f den s f nwy-  
nth, f nwy-nth, f nwg-nat, f edi-cly, f  
swe-bal, a bel-pic, a mun-tyr, a pie/ven,  
a boh/vie, a gal/bud

TURKEY(Abbott): a rum-sev, a apu/ven, a  
ven-tri, a vie s a bud, f rom-tyn, f lyo-  
spa(sc), f tyn/wes, f gre-bul(sc), a bud  
s a vie, f ion s f rom-tyn, f ank/ bla,  
a smy/con

SUMMER/FALL 1920 orders due Thursday, Febru-  
ary 26, 1976.

1973AYec, Autumn/Winter 1729

Error: overlooked printing order for Eng  
f ska c a sco-got for Fall 1729. Also,  
in 1729 SCC, france owns cre.

Autumn 1729: Spain R F Pap-Tus

Winter 1729:

AUSTRIA(C.D.): SP

ENGLAND(Hubbard): B A Yor

FRANCE(Drews): B A tou, a auv, a ver

OTTOMANS(Osmanson): b f smy

POLAND(Swies): b a war, a pos

RUSSIA(monahan): sp

SPAIN(Kadlecek): sp

cont. next page.

SPRING 1730 orders due Thursday, February 26, 1976.

#### Winter 1729 Positions:

austria: a hol, a ven, a gal; england: a got, f nth, f ska, f chr, f bal, f bot, a pom, a min, f nwg, f por, a ast, a yor; france: f cre, a gra, a ara, f tun, a mil, a tyr, a rhi, a net, f lyo, f sty, f nty; ottomans: f pap (nc), f nap, a boh, a vie, a bud, a tra, a bul, a cau, a sin, f smy; poland: a bra, a pru, a kra, a war, a pos; russia: a ang, f sto, a var, a mol, a rum, a ast; spain: f wes.

1973BU, Spring 1922/Vote

Stand-by for Italy: Ron Kelly.

2-way Draw Vote: defeated. Only 2 yes votes received from ger/aus.

#### Spring 1922:

AUSTRIA(Kovalcik): a tri / ita a tus-ven/nso, a ukr s a bud-gal, a vie s a gal-boh, a bud-gal, a gal-boh

ENGLAND(Greenwell): a stp-mos, a nwy-stp, a spa-rom, f wes c a spa-rom, f tyr c a spa-rom, f tun s f tyn, f nth-eng, f bal / ger a kie-pru/nso/

GERMANY(Barents): a pie s a tyo-ven, f lyo / eng a spa-tus/nso/, a ber/sil, a war s eng a stp-mos, a sil-boh, a mun-tyo, a tyo-ven, a liv s eng a stp-mos, f mid-naf, a kie-mun

ITALY(Hulland?): NMR. a tus h, a rom h

RUSSIA(Hendry): a mos /a/, a sev s a mos

TURKEY(Blank): f bla h, f aeg-ion, f ion-adr, f nap s f aeg-ion, a apu / ita a tus-ven /nso/

SUMMER/FALL 1922 orders due Thursday, February 26, 1976

1973CZec, Autumn/Winter 1728

Autumn 1728: England R F Var OTE. Ottomans: NMR. GM D F Mid; Poland R F Nth-Yor(ec) and gains Yor center.

#### Winter 1728:

AUSTRIA(Drews): SP

ENGLAND(Kadlecek): SP

FRANCE(Monahan): NMR. GM D F Bor(sc)

OTTOMANS(Mahler): B A Bul, F Smy

POLAND(Rocamora): B F Pos

SPAIN(Swies): SP

SPRING 1728 orders and vote on concession to Poland-Ottoman Empire (proposed by Ott.) on Thursday, February 26, 1976.

#### Winter 1728 Positions:

austria: a bav; england: f nth, f nwg, f lon, f sco(wc); france: a net, a ndy, a rhi, a tou, a sav; ottomans: f bar, a ast, a kie, f bri, f wes, f sty, f sar, f lyo, f nty, a mil, a tyr, a ven, a bud, a mor, a bud; poland: a mos, a min, a kra, a boh, a sax, a kas, a han, a pom, a bra, f var, a ang, f chr, f ska, f den, a lap, f yor(ec), f pos; spain: a por, f sev, f gib, f mid, f gra.

1974HN, Summer/Fall 1906

Summer 1906: Russia R A Mos-Sev

#### Fall 1906:

AUSTRIA(Osmanson): f eas/ion, a gre h, a alb-tri, a vie s a tri-tyo, a tri-tyo, a bud h

ENGLAND(Fujihara): a mos/war/r/(stp, otb), a liv/pru, f bar h, f nwg h

FRANCE (McKeon): a mun-ber, a tyo-ven, f lyo h, f tun/ion, f tyn s f ion-nap, a tus s a tyo-ven, f ion-nap

GERMANY(Kelly): a kie s fra a mun-ber, a ruh/mun, f hel-den, f bot h/u/

ITALY(Swies): NMR. a ven h/r/(pie, apu, otb), f nap h/r/(apu, adr, otb), f rom h

RUSSIA(Blank): a sev-mos, a ukr s a sev-mos, a war s a pru/liv, f ber / fra a mun-ber /nso/r/(bal, otb), a boh/mun, f aeg / ita f nap-ion/nso/, f con-bul(sc), a pru h/u/

AUTUMN/WINTER 1906 orders due Thursday, February 26th, 1976.

#### Fall 1906 SCC:

Austria: hom, ser, gre, smy (6) sp

England: hom, nwy, stp(5) Bl, was 1 short

France: hom, spa, por, mun, tun, ber, ven, nap (10) b3

Germany: kie, den, bel, swe, hol (5) SP, no open home centers

Italy: ~~hap~~, ~~feh~~, rom (1) r2

Russia: mos, war, sev, rum, bul, ~~ber~~, con, ank (7) r1

1974HY, Spring 1906

FRANCE(McLendon): f nwg-cly, f mid-eng, a spa-gas, a mar / a spa-gas, a yor/edi

GERMANY(Fanelli): a war / ita a gal-ukr a sil s a war, a bur-par, a mun-bur, a ruh s a mun-bur, a lvp/edi, a kie s f nth-den, f nth-den, f lon-eng

ITALY(Kendter): apie/mar, a tus-ven, f rom-tus, f nap-ion, f tun-wes, f ion-aeg, a (cont. next page)

tri-ser, a vie-bud, a gal/urk  
 RUSSIA(Gallagher): f nwy-nth, f den s f nwy-  
 nth/r/(ska, bal, hel, otb), f stp(nc)-nwy,  
 a fin-swe, a mos/war, a ukr s a mos-war,  
 a sev/mos, a arm/sev, f bal h, f rum h

SUMMER/FALL 1906 orders due Thursday, February 26, 1976.

-----

1974Nd1, Spring 1022

ENGLAND(Osmanson): a mon h, a oxf-glo, a che-  
 shr, f cab s f ngc, a her-bue, a mer s a  
 mon, f dyf s f brk-bri/r/(wic, car, otb),  
 f brk-bri

MUNSTER(Hyatt): f heb-nmi, f min-sky, f wif-  
 wmi, f slb-iat, a ros-mea, a cas-off, a  
 mou-plu, a dub s a mou-plu/r/(tar, kil,  
 wic, otb), a don-spe, a oma s a arm, a  
 arm h, a ern-tyr, a cor-wat, f bri-nsg,  
 f ssg s f bri-nsg, f stg s f bri-nsg, f  
 wex s f bri-nsg

SCOTLAND(Fanelli): a sut-dur, a alc-lis, a  
 dow s ork a dal, f drb-dub, f sis s f drb-  
 dub

ORKNEY(C.D.): f man, f kin, f isl, a dal  
 all hold

SUMMER/FALL 1022 orders due thursday, February 26, 1976.

-----

1975G, Spring 1906

Stand-by for France: Lee Kendter

Spring 1906:

AUSTRIA(Hinmon): f gre/alb/a/, a ser/rum, a  
 bud s a tri-vie, a bul s army ser-um/a/,  
 a tri-vie

ENGLAND(Cooper): a nwy/stp, f bar s a nwy-stp  
 f iri-mid, f eng s f iri-mid, f gas-bre

FRANCE(Kirk): G.O. used. a bur h/r/(mar,  
 gas, pic, ruh, otb), a spa h, f mid s a  
 spa h/r/(gas, por, nat, wes, otb)

GERMANY(Amer): f den-nth, f swe-fin, a kie-  
 ber, a ruh-mun, a bel-bur, a par s a bel-  
 bur, a boh s a mun-tyr, a mun-tyr

ITALY(Young): a vie s rus a gal-bud, a alb  
 s f ion-gre, f ion-gre, f ven-adr, a rom-  
 ven

RUSSIA(Sabo): a ukr-war, a mos s f stp(nc) h,  
 a gal/bud, a con-bul, f stp(nc) h, f aeg/  
 gre, a rum s a gal-bud, f bla s a con-bul

SUMMER/FALL 1906 orders due Thursday, February 26, 1976.

-----

1975T, Autumn/Winter 1904

Stand-by for France: Eric Luft, 434 West  
 Walnut St., Apt. 3, North Wales, PA 19454  
New Player for Turkey is Steve Brooks, 4960  
 B Ave. C, Great Falls, MT 59405.

COA: Jim Lawson, Rm. 550, Henday Hall,  
 Lister Hall, 116th & 87th Ave., Edmonston,  
 Alta, CANADA T6G 2H6 (no orders!)

Autumn 1904: Austria R A Liv-Pru; Germany  
 R A Kie-Ber, and F Bal-OTB.

Winter 1904:

AUSTRIA(Mahler): B a vie

ENGLAND(Fujihara): sp

FRANCE(Lawson): nmr., will remain 2 short

GERMANY(Warden): sp

ITALY(Birsan): sp

RUSSIA(lakofka): sp

TURKEY(Brooks): D A Arm

SPRING 1905 orders due Thursday, February 26, 1976.

Winter 1904 positions:

austria: a gal, a war, a pie, a tyr, a ven,  
 f bul(sc), f adr, a pru, a vie; england:  
 a liv, f bal, a den, a stp, f bot, f swe,  
 f nth; france: a kie, a ruh, a bur, a mar,  
 f tun, f tyn; germany: a mun, a ber; italy:  
 f nap, f tus; russia: a mos; turkey: a apu,  
 a sev, f aeg, f ion.

-----

1975AF, Summer/Fall 1905

Summer 1905: Turkey NMR. GM D A Arm

Fall 1905:

AUSTRIA(Johnson): a bud-vie, a gre s rus  
 a rum-bul, f ven h, f adr-ion, f nap s  
 ita a rom

FRANCE(Carlton): f lvp-wal, a yor-lon, f  
 eng s a yor-lon, f bre-mid, a pie/ven,  
 a tus s a pie-ven, f tyn/nap

GERMANY(Eddy): f mid-wes, a spa-mar, a gas-  
 par, a ruh s a bur-mun, a bur-mun, f hol-  
 kie, f bel-nth

ITALY(C.D.): a rom h

RUSSIA(Goldston): f lon h/a/, f nth-den,  
 a nwy-edi, f nwg c a nwy-edi, a tyr s  
 aus f ven, a rum/bul, a arm-ank, f bla  
 s a arm-ank, a bul/con

TURKEY(Morphy?): f aeg h, a con h

AUTUMN/WINTER 1905 orders PLUS vote on a  
 concession to Russia all due Thursday,  
 February, 26, 1976.

cont. next page.

Fall 1905 SCC:

Austria: tri, bud, vie, ser, gre, nap, ven  
(7) B2  
France: bre, spa, por, lon, lvp, tun, ~~xxx~~,  
~~xxx~~ (6) R1  
Germany: hom, hol, ~~den~~; bel, par, ~~xxx~~, mar  
(7) SP, was 1 short  
Italy: ~~xxx~~, rom (1) SP, lost 1  
Russia: hom, rum, ~~xxx~~, swe, nwy, bul, den,  
edi, ank (11) B3, was 1 short  
Turkey: con, smy, ~~xxx~~ (2) SP, lost 1

AUTUMN/WINTER 1905 orders plus a vote on a concession to Russia all due Thursday, February 26, 1976.

-----

## 1975CS, SUMMER/FALL 1903

Note: McGee is resigning from this game due to lack of time as result of transfer to more active duty station. New player for Austria is Walter Blank, RFD 1, Box 181, Ontario, WI 54651. (See below for Italy)

Stand-by for Germany: Richard Swies.

COA: Ron Stephens, 1044 S. 16th, #2, Lincoln, NE 68508.

Summer 1903: England R F Eng-Bre

Fall 1903:

AUSTRIA(McGee-Blank): a Tyo/Sil/imp/, A bul-rum s a bud, f gre/aeg, f tri-adr, a bud s a bul-rum, a vie s a tyo-sil/imp/  
ENGLAND(Strittmatter): f wal/lon, a liv h, f den/hel, f bre ~~xxx~~/r/(pic, gas, oth)  
FRANCE(Stephens): f eng/lon, f iri/wal, f mid s a par-bre, a par-bre, a mar-bur  
GERMANY(McDonald?): HMR. a edi, a bel, f nth a mun, a ber all hold  
ITALY(Cooper): A tun h, f ion h, f tyn h, a ven h  
RUSSIA(Albano): f bal s a swe-den, f nwy/nth, a sil-gal, a war s a sil-gal, a con h, f bla s a con, a rum/bul/r/(ukr, sov, oth)  
TURKEY(Kendter): f aeg/con, a smy s f aeg-con

Also, new player for Italy is: Jim Cooper, Preston Haven, Dallas, TX 75230!

AUTUMN/WINTER 1903 orders due Thursday, February 26, 1976

Fall 1903 SCC:

Austria: hom, ser, gre, bul, rum (7) bl  
England: ~~xxx~~, lon, lvp, ~~den~~ (2) r2  
France: hom, spa, por (5) sp  
Germany: hom, hol, bel, edi (6) bl  
Italy: hom, tun (4) sp  
Russia: hom, ~~xxx~~, swe, nwy, ank, con, den  
(9) bl  
Turkey: ~~xxx~~, smy (1) r1

## VERHANDELEN, CONT.

The one of the four that I have not contributed to at all until now received a very low rating (5.9; the fourth received 6.8). DU, to which I contribute more than anyone (in fact, more than any two people, lately) received the highest rating of all, 8.8.

When you make a statement, you have the responsibility to back it up. It is much easier to condemn/destroy than to support/create...especially if you don't bother to give reasons. Any fool can do that.

\* \* \*

Verhandeln #6, Suggestions for House Rules:

Once it was necessary for each GM to include many rule interpretations in his House Rules, but now that everyone has the "new" (1971) rulebook these are almost entirely unnecessary, and almost everyone rules identically in each situation. There are several instances in which methods vary among GM's, and here I will recommend some methods over others and give my reasoning.

First there is a question of how to assign positions. Some GM's assign countries by lot. Others permit players to express their preferences, and use one system or another to break ties. Some just flip a coin when two or more players want the same country at the same level of preference. Others prefer to insure, if physically possible, that no player receives worse than his fourth choice, say. The only argument I have heard against the preference system is that players are supposed to be able, with near certainty, to select the single country they most desire--allegedly one can beat the system by putting his real choice second or third. This is unadulterated claptrap. There are just too many variables to consider. The preference system, however, does give a player the chance to eliminate several countries from those he might play. This is important, especially to people who don't play many games. Who wants to play Austria once and Italy twice before he gets a crack at Russia or England? Who wants to play any country three times before he gets a first chance at one or another of the others? Yet it can happen using lots, as the latter happened to me, for example. The only reason I can think of for assigning by lot is that the GM is too lazy to work it out, or he doesn't really care about his players.

A no-doubt controversial house rule, but one that might help make publishers a little more responsive to peer pressure, is a

(cont. next page)



# VERHANDELN, CONT.

provision that any GM/publisher who defaults on his own games is automatically dropped from any games played under those house rules. So long as the rule is clear and the player has the chance to see it before the game starts (so that he can withdraw if he dislikes it), no complaint can make any sense.

Another rule similar to the above is that when a player drops from any game he is playing under the set of house rules in question, he is automatically dropped from all. The intention is to discourage the despicable people who are so lazy and irresponsible that they'll drop from a poor position while retaining a good position in the same one.

A rule which everyone ought to follow is to prohibit multiple entries in a single game from the same town or local phone area. To be able to meet frequently in person with another player or to phone him any time without cost is a great advantage; GM's have some responsibility to give each player as equal a starting position as they can, then leaving it up to the game and the players' skills to determine the winner.

The single question on which GM's seem most to vary today is the procedure for voted draws. Some GM's count any failure to vote as a vote for the draw. This strikes me as a lazy desire to get the game over with, no matter what. It is easy to forget to vote, especially when you don't favor the draw in the first place or when it is absurd. There are even times when a player who has a win or good draw wrapped up misses a move, still not losing his secure position, but thereby inadvertently "voting" for a lower draw. Counting "not voting" as "yes" is a peculiar alchemy indeed.

Other GM's have elaborate systems for who must vote for and who can vote against a draw and still have enough to pass. The general rule many follow which is simple and easy to apply is that a vote must be unanimous yes unless no center changes hands in three game-years, in which case the GM may declare a draw even if someone is recalcitrant (say he has a locked-up 14 unit position and want to play until his opponents drop out). This takes some judgement from the GM, as it is barely conceivable that a situation could be stagnant in centers held for three years, but potentially breakable in the future. Some provision must be included to account for those players who trade centers in an otherwise stagnant

situation in order to get around the three-year rule.

Other than in the above situation, a draw vote ought to always require unanimous yes (as should a concession to win). It is not the GM's job to judge that one player is too small to effect a change, except where nothing has happened for many game years, as above.

How should the draw vote be revealed to the players? A GM, by revealing who voted how, can give important information to some players. For example, two players have allied and agreed to a two-way draw. One asks for such a vote, and the other votes nay, planning to stab his ally at a later time, while the remaining opponents vote yes. If the GM reveals who voted how, the plans of the ally are revealed--in other words, he must either prematurely stab when the draw vote comes up (and when his ally will be particularly wary, if he's smart) or he must give up his plans and vote yes. If it is not revealed how each player voted, then the player planning the stab can say that an opponent voted against the draw; and no matter what the opponent says, the target won't really know whether his ally is playing him false or not. Of course, the opponent can call for a vote, then vote no, and try to convince each of the allies that the other was the one who voted no, intending the stab! In other words, if the GM reveals how each player voted, he has robbed players of several options. On the other hand, in a face-to-face game probably each player would know how each other voted, and in a real-life situation each country would probably know where each country stood. Whether you want to reveal the vote or not depends on whether you think of DIPLOMACY in game--or life--terms, and on whether you think postal DIPLOMACY ought to be as close to MTF DIP as possible, or that it ought to be different. My own method is to say only whether the vote succeeded--I do not even give the count.

One thing a GM should NOT do is try to regulate playing styles. I have seen suggestions that 'non-diplomatic' players should be excluded from games. How can you objectively separate the non-diplomatic players from those willing to negotiate? I have no idea. Another actual house rule stated that anyone found playing in cross-game alliances would immediately be thrown out. How could you prove something like this, and even if you could, is it the job of the GM to police playing styles, no matter how unfair cross-  
(cont. next page)

## VERHANDELN, CONT.

game alliances are? My basic principle is that the GM ought to interfere as little as possible with the actual course of the game; rules as above are unnecessary and cannot be practicably enforced. #end#

Next issue! Len Lakofka's rebuttal to Lew's "criticisms".

## GAME OPENINGS, CONT.

ing new countries such as "Grand Duchies", etc. But, I think that it is now closed to entries. However, you could ask to see if they have any spots left. Very promising new gamezine.

LIAISONS DANGEREUSES #66. Lenard Lakofka, 644 Briar Place, Chicago 60657. Openings for novices only. GF is \$7.00 which includes subscription. Sub rate is 9/\$2.00. Ditto. RUNESTONE #105. John Leeder, 208 Haysboro Cr., SW, Calgary, Alta., Canada T2V 3G3. Ditto Openings in Runestone goes for a gamefee of \$2 + sub (\$1.50 GF for IDA members) which is 1¢/page plus postage. There are the bare-bone games run outside of Runestone for 20¢ per season + postage. As the number of issues indicate, this fella is reliable. Excellent ditto printing.

THE MIXUMAXU GAZETTE, #44. Robert Lipton, Box 1962 Lafayette College, Easton, PA 18042. Mimeo. Has openings for GF of \$1 plus sub. Sub is 10¢/issue + postage. Hard to believe, but this is becoming one of the "old-timers", that is, having made it to issue #44--Bob is old hat in our circles.

IMLADRIS, #5. Jeremy Paulson, Apt. C-19, 63-60 98th St., Rego Park, NY 11374. Mimeo. GF is \$3 + sub, subscriptions being 8/\$2.00. Excellent mimeo printing!

That's all in openings for this issue! More next issue...

## HOBBY NEWS, CONT.

Sacks is willing to head up the final push on the investigation. Also, it has been rumored that IDA will be given part of the entrance fees for the DipCon portion of Origins II in exchange for running the event. These monies, Edi says, will be used to defray prize costs and extra-ordinary costs. I am not sure where I read it (maybe Bushwacker?) but this has since been confirmed by Avalon Hill.

(cont. next col.)

Well, the Gordon Anderson controversy has broiled over, finally. There is quite a bit here on my desk from several people concerning the charges, counter-charges and defence on all sides. Might as well as go through the mess?

First, let me print comments (for print!) from Lew Pulsipher on the whole affair.

Lew Pulsipher: I'm asking John Boyer to print this, and sending it to the rest of you (Rosenberg, Leeder, Birsan, Buchanan) for information or because I have extra copies. The bit about Calhamer's disavowal of obligation might be worth printing in several places; I don't know whether anyone else will recall it or not. ((If I have space and time, I will print parts of Calhamer's letter. ED))

Gordon Anderson recently made some accusations concerning CITE 75 and related matters. He has stated that he will make those accusations and supporting material public. Consequently I think it is necessary for me to make several comments, as someone not involved in the charges, and not a participant in the tournament, though I was present.

First, Viking Systems accepted entry fees for the CITE 75 DIPLOMACY tournament, and Viking Systems is responsible for providing the prizes of that tournament. Any trouble that Viking Systems may have had with the Chief Gamesmaster, Allan Calhamer, or anyone else is irrelevant. Viking Systems is obligated to pay. If (and I do not believe it for a moment) Viking Systems or Gordon Anderson has been victimized by someone, that is its/his fault, and he must take up the problem with that person.

Gordon Anderson states that Allan Calhamer has not even provided him with a list of who entered this tournament. But Viking Systems collected fees, not Allan Calhamer; how would Calhamer even know who entered, except as he was told by VS? Moreover, before the tournament began Calhamer stated publicly that he had nothing to do with the finances of the tournament and that he accepted no obligations concerning same. He stated that he was merely Chief Gamesmaster, and no more. He made this statement after asking for quiet in one of the two rooms in which the tournament was held; I cannot say whether he made the statement in the other room as well.

Anderson has stated that "Viking Systems did not give Michael Rocamora a bad check." If a bad check exists, presumably Rocamora still possesses it. Would it help clarify matters if, say, John Boyer used his Gestefax machine to reproduce this check in Impassable (cont. next page)



## HOBBY NEWS, CONT.

(assuming it's legal). ((I'm willing if Mike will send me the check for copying. ED)) I think this might quickly destroy whatever credibility Gordon Anderson retains, if he is wrong. Anderson talks as though VS is incorporated. Has anyone checked this? Unless VS is formally incorporated, Anderson is personally liable to pay tournament prizes. Whether it is or not, the legal situation does not obscure the moral obligation of Anderson to pay the prizes." #end#

Now, I have this little piece of information from Walter Blank: "If people have asked if Wartenburg & I are suing Anderson & Viking Systems, YOU BET!" The primary import of this bit of information is that the co-champions of CITEX 75 are going to sue Anderson!

Now, to Allan Calhamer's letter to John Baker in which Allan covers Gordon Anderson's charges (if we have space and time, we'll get to Anderson's letter also):

Letter by Allan Calhamer, dated Jan. 22:

"Thank you for your recent letter, quoting a paragraph from a letter from Gordon Anderson. In answer to his charges, the following is correct:

- 1) Gordon Anderson has never given me any cash, or any money in any other form, ever in his life, for any purpose whatsoever.
- 2) I did not select the trophies for the Diplomacy tournament of 1975. Gordon selected the seven trophies for the tournament. He then asked me to have the winners choose their trophies from among those seven. I did so.
- 3) At the same time that he talked with me about the trophies, Gordon also asked me to tell the winners that their prize money would be mailed to them during the next week. I told them that Gordon had asked me to relay that message.
- 4) During the tournament, the winner of the 1974 tournament, Mike Rocamora, advised me verbally that he had never received his prize for the 1974 tournament. That tournament was directed by Gordon Anderson. I played no part in its management. If I had known earlier that the prize had not been paid for the previous tournament, I would not have agreed to direct the 1975 tournament.
- 5) I have never taken, and do not have, any property of any kind belonging to Gordon Anderson. I suppose the "models" he refers to are the metal markers in the form of tanks and ships which he had for use in the Diplomacy games. These markers were gathered together at the end of the tournament and left

in the playing room, which was part of the complex of rooms being used for the Game Show. That show was still going on under Gordon's direction. Incidentally, the value of those pieces was probably about twenty dollars, not a thousand dollars. When I first brought out Diplomacy in 1959, I priced markers of the same size and similar configuration, painted in seven colors. At that time, Tootsietoy quoted them to me at seven eighths of a bent apiece. I would guess that similar pieces would be worth no more than a nickel apiece today. There were six boards in play, of which at least two were using wooden pieces. The remaining four boards had to borrow pieces from board to board as the games went on, suggesting that there were fewer than the standard number of 112 pieces per board available. About 400 pieces at a nickel each extends to about twenty dollars, not one thousand.

- 6) The only printing I had was eight dollars' worth, not one hundred. This printing was designed by myself, let out to be printed by myself, paid for by myself, brought to the tournament by myself, and taken away again by myself.
- 7) Immediately after the tournament, I mailed a list of the prizewinners, in their proper order, to Gordon, retaining a copy.
- 8) A few days after the tournament ended, I sent Gordon a list of the results of each game of the tournament. This list necessarily contained the names of all the participants.
- 9) Gordon sent me just one letter after the tournament. Not a single one of his current charges was mentioned in the letter. I replied instructing him to communicate with me only by letter. He has never communicated with me again." end of letter.

I will now print a letter from Gordon Anderson to Scott Rosenberg (editor of IDA) which was copied and sent to several people including myself. It follows:

From Gordon Anderson to Scott Rosenberg, dated January 12th: ((I believe this is the letter to which John Baker referred to in his letter to Calhamer which resulted in the above letter from Calhamer))

"I have been disappointed with the actions of the I.D.A. Council ((I'm not correcting his spelling or English)) in the past two years. It (the Council) under the leadership of Edi Birsan has boiled down to one thing. Edi Birsan and Company's feeble attempts to drive me from the hobby and the I.D.A.

Edi Birsan, Gil Neiger and others have  
(cont. next page)

## HOBBY NEWS, CONT.

used and are still using the Council Courier, the Diplomacy Review and other publications of the I.D.A. to do as much as possible to discredit me and have resorted to the use of libel in the various I.D.A. publications to achieve this end. It is his attempt to drive me from the hobby and to have the I.D.A. back him in any business venture that he wishes to try.

I will now bring to your attention some facts that some people do not want published. (Also more facts are included in the Viking's Newsletter, a copy of which is enclosed.)

1) Gil Neiger did receive my campaign statement (copy enclosed) but he refused to publish it. It is my feeling that with the publishing of that statement that I would have been Elected Editor of the I.D.A. However by not presenting my side I was denied any chance to clear false statements that had been made against me.

2) Gil Neiger and Edi Birsan then proceeded to publish as much false, defamatory and libelous material about me as they could to keep me off the ballot, however they did everything they could to see to it that a person who was not qualify did get on the ballot.

4) Viking Systems did not give Michael Rocamora a bad check.

5) Allan Calhamer was given the cash for the prizes at CITEEX-75 and DipCon VIII on Sunday August 17, 1975 and he also selected the trophies. He was supposed to pay the winners of the tournament when the tournament was over. Mr Calhamer still has in his possession over \$1,000.00 worth of models and over \$100.00 worth of printing that he was entrusted with and has not returned to Viking Systems, Inc. This material was used to run the DipCon portion of CITEEX-75. Mr. Calhamer has yet to provide myself or Viking Systems with a list of who won or even who entered the Diplomacy tournament. In addition Mr. Calhamer has refused to talk to me on the phone or to even answer my letters.

6) I have received four letters on the subject of the prize money, one from Robert J. Wartenberg on January 2, 1976 which had been mailed on December 27, 1975. A copy of that letter is enclosed along with my reply. A letter from Walter Blank which was received on January 9, 1975, no date as to when it was mailed, however it was mailed to the wrong address. I have not yet had a chance to answer it. (a copy of his letter is enclosed). I received two letters from Charles W. Reinsel

(copies enclosed) which I will not answer. Until I had received the letter from Mr. Wartenberg I had firmly believed that there were no problems left over from CITEEX-75 & DipCon VIII that affected the general public. I am now embarking on a course that will correct this problem that has recently come to my attention.

7) Edi Birsan refuses to send me the Council Courier, even though I have provided him with what was required for me to receive it.

8) Bill number 75.104 in effect says lets throw Gordon W. Anderson out of the IDA.

9) Bill number 75.100 says lets let Edi control the money too.

10) Bill number 75.103 says that Edi Birsan wants to run a Diplomacy convention but not in New York. In truth Edi just wants to run Diplomacy the ways he wants with no one else to even control him or tell him what to do. In truth he would be happy to run DipCon in Chicago if the powers that be would let him.

11) I am turning all of the material (copies of) that I have in my possessions over to John Leeder the current Ombudsman in the hopes that I can receive some relief from his office of the screw job that the IDA Council is trying to give me. If I cannot find relief in the office of the Ombudsman then I will be required to seek relief from the courts. I will also be compelled to seek relief from the courts if there is any more false, defamatory or libelous material published about me in any of the IDA publications or in IDA sponsored publications."

End of Gordon Anderson's letter.

Gordon goes on in providing information of CITEEX-76! Well, my advice is to ignore that and to go to Origins II. But, now we print Allan Calhamer's second letter, a reply to a letter from Wartenburg: Calhamer's Letter to Wartenburg: (dated Jan. 14, 1976)

"Thank you for your letter, received today, which enclosed a copy of a letter to you signed "Gordon W. Anderson" and dated Jan. 2, 1976. In reply to the statements in the letter signed "Gordon W. Anderson" I hereby state the following:

1) At no time did I receive or handle any money at all, for any purpose whatsoever, in connection with the Diplomacy tournament held in Chicago in August of 1975.

2) Just before the tournament started, I made a statement to many of the players assembled, to the effect that I had nothing to do with the financial aspects of the

(cont. next page)

## HOBBY NEWS, CONT.

of the tournament. That statement is still true today.

3) Since I did not receive any money, I did not pay any money and did not pocket any money.

4) At the end of the tournament, Gordon asked me to award the trophies, and to tell each winner that his prize money would be mailed to him during the next week. I believe I relayed that message verbally to each winner, representing it as Gordon's statement.

5) By the end of the tournament, I had decided that I did not wish to cooperate with Gordon in any further projects. Therefore, I hung up the telephone upon hearing his voice, and sent him a letter, stating that our cooperation in connection with the tournament was completed, that I did not wish to cooperate with him in any further project, and that he should communicate with me only by letter. I have never received any communication from him since that time.

6) I sent Gordon a list of the results of the tournament as soon as I had it ready, which was two or three days after the tournament ended. I sent him a list of the prize-winners in my letter to him dated August 18, 1975.

7) Gordon never asked me to send him any material. He sent me just one letter after the tournament. That letter is dated September 7 and contains no request for material. My letter to him directing that he communicate only by letter is dated September 10."

End of Calhamer's letter to Wartenburg.

Seeing that there is still more space left in this issue, I might as well as print Scott Rosenberg's reply to Gordon Anderson's letter printed above in this column:

Letter from Scott Rosenberg to Gordon Anderson, dated ?:

"Thank you for the information you have sent me.

I think it needs to be pointed out that any IDA member (including Council members like Birsan and Neiger) has the right to say whatever he wants in the DR. You, of course, have the right to reply. I think it would be a rather stupid and pointless move on your part to bring in legal cases and lawsuits--because things printed in the DR are not and cannot, by definition, be libel. You'd lose your case and your lawyer's fees.

As to your facts:

1) What Gil has told me is that he never received your campaign statement. However, even if you had sent it to him (and I really can't say whether you did--it's your word

against Gil's), your letter is dated September 26, 1975. If you check DIPLOMACY REVIEW Vol. IV #4 page 2, you will see that the official deadline for campaign statements was September 23rd.

2) You claim that Gil and Edi "proceeded to publish as much false, defamatory and libelous material about me as they could" to insure my election. This is simply untrue. The only statement that I think either of them made anywhere was Edi's statement in US DOLLARS that your check to Rocamora had bounced. We'll get to that in number 4.

3) No attempt was made to keep you off the ballot. I think you'd better substantiate such claims before throwing them around. As a matter of fact, if I remember correctly, Gil went out of his way to let you get on the ballot--even though your entry was late.

4) Maybe Vikings Systems didn't. Maybe Gordon Anderson did. Whether the check was from one or the other, it did bounce.

5) I have no information about this. I will attempt to contact Calhamer and see what's going on.

7) Edi has told me that the supply of stamped, self-addressed envelopes you provided him with ran out, and you did not replenish it. It is your responsibility, not his, to do so. He has enough work as it is; it's your responsibility to ensure your continued receipt of it.

8) It does not, and I think your lawyers will corroborate this--it says Gordon Anderson is thrown off IDA committees. You are still a member. As far as I can tell, even though you were a member of a number of committees, your participation was nil. I know for sure that this was so in the Judiciary Committee and the Publications Committee.

9) Bill number 75.100 was stupid, I agree; it was killed, and even if it had passed would have been struck down as unconstitutional.

10) Note that Bill number 75.103 was proposed by Lew Pulsipher, not Edi Birsan. I think you are aware that these two gentlemen rarely see eye to eye on matters. The bill simply provided for the contingency that, IF Origins II were chosen, \$80 would be appropriated. You keep screaming about Birsan's being in business for himself and so forth ad nauseam--don't you realize that he has no financial interest in this whatsoever? That \$80 would go to Avalon Hill, not Birsan, again ONLY IF the Council and the Diplomacy public decided that Origins would be the next DipCon.

11) Again, you have every right to appeal  
(cont. next page)

## HOBBY NEWS, CONT.

to the Judiciary Committee. On the other hand, I will reiterate my suggestion that legal action will get you nowhere and will make you even more of a pariah than you are now, if that be possible.

I have a few comments of my own to make, concerning the alleged trademark of DipCon. From lawyers I have consulted, you have no case (under "Abandonment of Use" or anything else) for trademarking that word. And before you go waving at everyone that it's trademarked and they can't use it I demand legal, notarized proof that it is trademarked--because, quite frankly, I don't believe you.

If you cannot provide such proof, I (and I think the Council) will maintain that the Diplomacy public as represented by IDA has the rights to the name, and I have every intention of proposing that wherever the IDA decides to hold its general meeting will be called DipCon.

If you can provide such proof, who knows? We might be able to appeal the trademark and win.

The main point is that trademark or no trademark, the Diplomacy players are probably going to go to the con that includes the IDA general meeting, no matter what it's called. If you had played fair and not tried this scheme, there would have been little doubt that the next IDA meeting would indeed be held at Citex. With your foolish legal schemes you have alienated most of the hobby to the point where I think even if the IDA held its meeting at Citex, few would attend.

Good luck on your case in the Judiciary Committee." End of letter.

IMPASSABLE #61  
117 Garland Dr.  
Carlisle, PA 17013  
U.S.A.



You are asked to stand-by, see  
2 for more information\_\_\_\_\_  
Your sub is ended, to continue  
getting this most marvelous  
of gamezines, send more dough\_\_\_\_\_  
Lucy you! You're getting this  
as a free sample\_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\* NOTE: DEADLINE RESET TO SATURDAY, \*\*  
\*\* February 28, 1976! \*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

FIRST CLASS MAIL

Whew, that was a lot of quick typing! At least some of it was interesting, but I printed it mostly because I feel that this is no feud, but a very bad of how any erratic individual can disrupt the hobby and ruin its meager reputation. If any problems were caused by Anderson in his relations to the hotels in Chicago or anyone else, it would affect future conventions in Chicago! IDA and the people it represent just can't allow Anderson to ruin its reputation and that of the hobby! I have bent backwards to assuage Mr. Anderson because of my sloppy handling of the 1974 elections, but I now have no reserve of kind thoughts about him.

One of these days, I'll be getting around to doing special projects on my own. In the back of my head are the following possible projects to make use of my Gestefax: a Diplomacy Calendar of events and important dates of historical note, A collection of Who's Who material (nothing like Peery's!), The Best of Impassable, Copying and improving with permission many variants of Diplomacy, and so on. The only problem is a lack of time! My plans have slowly jelled to the point where I have decided to remain as a Diplomacy publisher for the next several years, but to limit myself severely to its single aspects and not to enter games or play politics in IDA, etc. I think the hobby has a need for a publication with up-to-date reporting on news and events of the hobby. This will eventually become the major feature of IMPASSABLE. Of course, games, articles and filler will continue, but perhaps to a lesser degree. Whatever, polls will be taken to measure these changes. Peace.



Scott Marley  
12682 Swidler  
Santa Ana, CA 92705

S-65

FIRST CLASS MAIL